DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 874 RC 008 945

AUTHOR	McConnell, Beverly
TITLE	Bilingual Mini-School Tutoring Project. Evaluation Progress Report Number 3, Mid-Year Evaluation, Program Year 2, December 1974.
INSTITUTION	Mabton School District, Wash.
SPONS AGENCY	Washington Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia.
REPORT NO	EPR-3
PUB DATE	Dec 74
NOTE	35p.; For related documents, see RC 008 943, 944, 946
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Bilingual Education; *Early Childhood Education; Educational Objectives; Formative Evaluation; *Interstate Programs; *Migrant Education; Mobile Educational Services; Paraprofessional Personnel; *Parent Participation; *Tutorial Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Washington

ABSTRACT

Initiated in February 1974, the Project consists of a mobile and a non-mobile component. In the mobile component, adults from the families who migrate are trained to serve as a teacher. These teaching adults tutor the children, usually in groups of 6 to 10 children, in each location to which they move. Since the public school has the primary responsibility for providing education, arrangements are made with the local schools to allow each adult to continue the tutoring. In the non-mobile component, the children leaving the Bilingual Mini Head Start program (see RC 008 937-942) are provided supplemental tutoring services. By continuing to work with these children outside of regular school hours, the children receive the continuation of instruction in the Spanish and English language program, the cultural knowledge lessons and activities, plus reinforcement of the instruction they receive in school in math and reading through continued work in the reading and math series begun as preschoolers. Covering the program's operations from July through December 1974, this report presents the third evaluation of the program's progress toward achieving the instititional, procedural, and educational outcome objectives. Overall, the objectives have either been met or partially met. Rationale for this program is briefly discussed. (NQ)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED116874

BILINGUAL MINI-SCHOOL TUTORING PROJECT

MABTON SCHOOL DISTRICT

FUNDED BY U.R.R.D.

Urban, Racial, Rural Disadvantaged Project of the Washington Sup't of Public Instruction

Testing Language Development in Spanish and English

Henry Milhofer, Supt.
Mabton School District
Mabton, Washington

Louise Gustafson
Project Manager
P.O. Box 2367
Pasco, Wa. 99302
509-547-8442

Rafael Guerra
Educational Director
La Grulla, Texas

Evaluation Progress Report Number 3
Mid-year Evaluation, Program Year 2
Prepared by Beverly McConnell, Evaluator

RC008945

BILINGUAL MINI-SCHOOL TUTORING PROJECT

A PROJECT WITH INTERSTATE COORDINATION TO PROVIDE CONTINUITY IN EDUCATION TO MIGRANT CHILDREN

Program Year Two, Mid-Year Evaluation Report

December, 1974

Mabton School District's URRD Project "Bilingual Mini-School Tutoring Project" was initiated February 1, 1974. This report represents the third progress report on this program, covering program operations from July 1, 1974, through December, 1974.

The report is organized in four sections:

1. The Rationale for this Program
2. Evaluation of Progress Toward Objectives
3. Narrative Progress Report
4. Conclusion

Report prepared by:

Beverly McConnell,
Evaluator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
THE RATIONALE FOR THIS PROGRAM	1
The Mobile Component	1
The Non-mobile Component	6
EVALUATION OF PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES	9
Institutional Objectives:	
1 (A) Coordination with School Administrators	9
1 (B) Contact with Families	14
1 (C) Enrollment of Children	15
Procedural Objectives:	
2.1 Use of Spanish and English	17
2.2 Teaching Bicultural Lessons	19
2.3 Teaching Math and Reading	20
Educational Outcome Objectives:	
3.1 Gains in First and Second Language	21
3.2 Mastery of Cultural Heritage	23
3.3 Accelerated Gains in Math and in Reading	24
SUMMARY OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES	25
NARRATIVE PROGRESS REPORT	26
CONCLUSION	31

THE RATIONALE FOR THIS PROGRAM

> What happens to a migrant child who moves four times in his first grade year, encountering a different "system" for the teaching of reading and mathematics at each school in which he enrolls?

THE MOBILE COMPONENT

The mobile component of the bilingual mini schools project represents an approach to the problems faced by this mobile child of migrant farm workers who moves from school to school.

Bilingual mini schools, using a combination of funding sources, trains an adult from the families who migrate to serve as a teacher (some men, some women). Other members of the families of these teaching adults are still working in the migrant stream and she or he moves with them. Since a number of families usually move together from one crop location to the next there are, among these families, a number of children. The teaching adult tutors these children in each location to which they move. She or he usually works with from six to ten children which is why the program is referred to as a "mini" school.

What about the responsibility of the public school? The project recognizes that the public school has the primary responsibility for providing education and all migrant children are helped to enroll in the schools. The administrative staff, with the teacher, makes contact with the school officials and explains that in addition to the school room instruction these children will receive, we would like to continue to work with the children we are

following for from one-and-one-half to two hours per day. During this time the tutoring teachers can work with the child bilingually, using the same math and reading series the child has already started using when enrolled either in Texas or at another site and also providing lessons in both Spanish and English. In this way, no matter what materials are in use at the local school, the child can continue with these basic areas of instruction using familiar materials in the special tutoring time. The school-room instruction will amount to extra reinforcement. In addition to the academic areas, the child will be provided lessons in both Spanish and English through a special language curriculum. And he will have lessons the content of which is to help him learn more about his own and other cultures.

The arrangements made with the local school administrator, the child and his parents, can be that the child receives this tutoring during the regular school day, on a released time basis from his classes. Or the tutoring can be during non-school hours, after school or in the "other half" of a short day program such as kindergarten.

Why this approach?
What else has been tried?

There have been educators of migrant children who have been very concerned about the confusion and learning loss that occurs when a child must continually change books and the approach to teaching of basic subjects, particularly in the crucial first years of school. One solution they have proposed in the past is

that if "migrant funds" from the federal government are provided a school that the schools should all agree to teach migrant children using the same curriculum materials. This would lessen the problems of the child of moving from school to school. However, this approach has always been defeated for practical reasons. School administrators have felt that a teacher in a classroom which received migrant children for a portion of the year has enough to contend with resulting from the higher child-teacher ratio during the migrant stay, and should not also be required to familiarize himself/herself with a whole new series of books from which to teach the migrant children.

An alternative to requiring teachers to use one set of materials with migrant children, and another with their year-round children, would be for migrant host schools to utilize the same materials proposed for migrant children for all children throughout the year. Most schools would not agree to limit their selection of teaching materials on this basis.

Another solution suggested has been to segregate the migrant children and to hire teachers who would teach only during the migrant season. If migrant curriculum materials were nationally mandated, this special teacher would use only these and no confusion would result from whatever local materials other teachers in the school used. However, this too poses practical problems. It is difficult to obtain qualified teachers for a short assignment. There may not be enough migrant children at any grade level to justify a special class. If migrant children from several grade levels are combined, the teacher must be very skillful in individualizing instruction. If she is not, she may confuse beginning

children by having them put into material above their skills, or frustrate older children by beginning over repeatedly so that no progress occurs. And any type of segregation of children, even when done for purposes of special instructional needs, is a cloudy civil rights area.

For all of the reasons described above, the proposals for mandating migrant curriculum materials have never been carried out. This leaves the schools using a great variety of materials and approaches and all the adjustment placed on the migrant child.

Bilingual Mini Schools represent a difierent approach to providing the migrant child with continuity in curriculum materials from site to site. The migrant adult teacher tutors the child during his home base period in Texas (the target site for this program is Grulla, Texas). The families move north and at each work stop arrangements are made to continue the tutoring, using the same materials. The child gets reading and math instruction from the public school in which he enrolls during the regular school year or anywhere a special school is offered during the summer for migrant children. And from the supplementary tutoring he gets a second period of reading and math instruction <u>using materials he has been using at previous sites</u>. Most of the host schools are not staffed to provide special language instruction so this aspect of the program, plus the bicultural activities represent an addition to his schooling.

Most of the concepts described above were operationally worked out by a companion program, Bilingual Mini Head Start. This preschool program provides bilingual, bicultural instruction by trained migrant adult paraprofessionals who move with the children.

From this program, which has operated three years, it has been found that it is possible to track the children from site to site and many children are served at two, three, or four different locations during their yearly migration. From 65% to 75% of the children served at the home base in the preschool program have been followed successfully to other sites during their migration. The program has worked out the logistics of how to provide administrative support to help find housing for the "mini" schools, how to coordinate with local programs, how to provide professional staff who move on an itinerant schedule to assist the paraprofessional teachers, and how to monitor project operations which have been carried out in four northern states to which families moved for work, as well as home base in Texas.

With the support of URRD money for teacher salaries and related costs while teachers are in Washington state schools, the program began its service to the school-age children this past year. Control and contrast groups have been tested in both language and the key academic areas in Texas this fall. The effects of moving with the children and providing continuity will therefore be measurable in one year's time when a full year of operation of the school-age program has taken place. All paraprofessional teachers are paid from a Title VII grant administered by Intermediate School District 104, Ephrata, Washington, when they are working in the Texas site or in work locations in states other than Washington state. Intermediate School District 104 also conducts the preschool companion program which is now into its fourth year of operation. The administrative, training, and evaluation staff of this program services this school-age extension, augmenting the URRD funds which are used.

THE NON-MOBILE COMPONENT

Bilingual Mini Head Start, above described, has operated year-round in two sites in Washington State: Connell and Moses Lake, Washington. The children leaving this preschool program go into two different schools from the Connell center, and into four different schools at the Moses Lake center. The parents of the children expressed a keen interest in seeing bilingual instruction continued, as well as special training in two languages and cultural activities. The supplementary tutoring idea provided the answer to this need. By continuing to work with the children outside of school hours they could receive the continuation of instruction in the Spanish and English language program, the cultural knowledge lessons and activities, plus reinforcement of the instruction the child is receiving in school in math and reading through continued work in the reading and math series begun as preschoolers. A referral form for public school teachers to indicate any concept areas they feel the child could use added help in provides a communication link between the classroom and the supplementary tutoring program. Lessons for kindergarten children are carried out during the "other" half day from his public school half-day kindergarten. Children in first, second grade, (or in special cases higher grades) are served on an after-school basis.

At Mabton there is no bilingual mini head start program in operation for preschool children. The program there began operation last spring with the migrant influx on a referral basis. Teachers simply referred children they felt could most benefit from extra tutoring. A year-round program for kindergarten children at Mabton whose parents felt they could benefit from an all

day program and who wanted the bilingual language, academic, and cultural instruction for their child during the "other half" of his kindergarten day is in planning but at the time of this evaluation has not yet become operational.

There are national implications involved in this non-mobile program. Many, many school districts have children who represent a small minority of their students who are scattered between many grades and schools. Urban Indian children, for example, are often "lost" within the larger majority in schools throughout a city. How to continue instruction for them that will offer them cultural identity and continued development of the language of the home is an unsolved problem. Civil Rights commissions are empowered to attempt to assure culturally relevant education for each child, but for practical reasons their attention goes to larger minorities. The practicality of a supplementary program such as the Bilingual Mini School model which brings together children of different ages and grade levels, from different schools throughout the city, who are provided with both individualized academic instruction and language and culture lessons by adults from the same cultural community would have utility in this situation.

Feeling that this program has wider implications, therefore, the evaluation of this program is keeping track of the different methods used to coordinate a supplementary program to that the child receives in his regular classroom. Several different administrative relationships have already been utilized at different sites. In Texas now, the program is operating on a

released time basis. This helps the teacher of the migrant classes who was burdened with an unreasonably large class size by releasing, serially, seven or eight children at a time who go for the tutoring. At Umatilla, Oregon, the tutoring teacher worked at space provided within the school and took children individually or in very small groups from classrooms throughout the day by a prearranged schedule worked out with the teachers as the target children were spread in several classes. The Connell program offers after-school instruction at space provided by one school; from the other school children go for after-school instruction to a day care center. At Moses Lake children are bussed to a central center and then to their homes all over the city.

To summarize, educators can look to this program to gain insight into two key questions:

For the Mobile Component:
Can the use of migrant adults, trained as teachers, provide meaningful continuity in the education of children in a moving population?

For the Non-Mobile Component:
Can the use of a supplementary tutoring program provide a practical way of providing continuing language and cultural instruction as well as academic reinforcement to a target group who represent a minority of children within a school district.

EVALUATION OF PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES

INSTITUTIONAL OBJECTIVE

1.1 ISD 104 will arrange with the schools of each target school district in which Mini Head Start children are enrolled in public school, and with the children's families, for a time and place for children to receive tutoring to supplement the regular school program, as evidenced by reports of contacts made with school officials and parents and enrollment in regular tutoring for at least 80% of the eligible children in each district.

FINDINGS:

(Part A) Coordination with School Administrators at Each Site

MOSES LAKE, WASHINGTON Site

At this site the program operates during non-school hours and at a central location (McCosh Community Center) rather than in school-provided facilities. Coordinative contacts have been made by the site coordinator to school administra- officials at all schools from which children are enrolled in the bilingual mini school program. These are: Longview Elementary, Garden Heights Elementary and Midway Elementary Schools. A referral form has been provided each school through which the regular teacher could specify concept areas or academic skills in which she feels the child could benefit from extra instruction. Project staff--the bilingual mini school teacher, the staff trainer, and the site coordinator have visited the schools by invitation to see a demonstration of the Title I program which offers tutorial instruction and for parent-teacher conferences, when their presence was requested by the parent.

CONNELL, WASHINGTON Site

Kindergarten children come in to the Bilingual Mini Head Start center after dismissal from morning kindergarten classes. They receive tutoring during the early afternoon. The teacher then travels to Mesa Elementary School where school officials have provided space for the program, and serves a group of children after school for 1-1/2 hours and then takes them home. After school tutoring is provided by a part-time teacher at the Connell Bilingual Mini Head Start center for children from the Connell school. The Bilingual Mini School teacher, and the staff trainer, have visited with each adminstrator and teacher of children enrolled in the program so that each is generally familiar with the materials and methods of instruction the children are receiving in school and in the bilingual mini school tutoring program.

Eligibility for the program services was originally limited to children who had "graduated" from the Bilingual Mini Head Start preschool program. However, school officials have asked the program to take a number of other children who they felt could benefit from the program and for which the school lacked resources to provide extra, individualized bilingual instruction. Some referrals have been accepted on a space available basis. These include children from a family from Mexico with children who had never been in any school before coming to Washington. One of these (birthdate unknown by the parents) has been placed in a fourth grade room from his approximate age and size but is doing first grade work at school and through our tutoring.

MABTON, WASHINGTON Site

The Project Manager and Evaluator have gone to Mabton twice for conferences with the federal projects officer, superintendent, principal, and kindergarten teacher to work out an operational plan for the program to begin during the winter months at Mabton. (A program was carried out last spring and early summer which was reported in the last evaluation. However, none has been in operation at Mabton during the period of this evaluation, July 1 through December, 1974.) A follow-up letter and phone calls by the project manager have been sent since these visits.

Lack of applicants with the specified qualifications set by the school advisory board, who live within the school district boundaries, appears to be a problem in getting the program launched. First priority for hiring set by the district was to employ staff to work as teacher aides in the classrooms, after which the staff person for this project would be employed. Failing to find sufficient applicants to fill all of these positions, school officials had indicated they might request a change from the advisory board as to either the mandatory qualifications for an applicant, or the requirement that he or she reside within school district boundaries, in order to allow others who might want to fill these positions to apply. This action has not taken place to date, however.

MOBILE PROGRAM SITES

PASCO, WASHINGTON

During July and August tutoring of school-age children was offered at the farm labor camp using trailer facilities. During these months no public school program was available for the children. (Earlier at this site, Mr. Guerra, the educational director, had met with the teacher in the public school and the tutoring was coordinated with the school.)

UMATILLA, OREGON

Tutoring of school-age children from Grulla began in the Umatilla area before the public schools opened. Contacts were also made with the school principal and after school opened the tutoring was carried out at the school in space provided for this purpose. Children were taken individually or in very small groups for tutoring sessions on a schedule worked out individually for each child with the teacher who had him in class. As an accommodation to the school, the tutoring teacher also worked with some children referred by the school as needing special help as well as the Grulla migrant children we were following.

GRULLA, TEXAS

A long series of meetings went into coordination at the home base site including visits by the project officer for the Title VII grant from Washington D.C. both last spring and this fall. These meetings included Grulla school administrative personnel and teaching staff, and administrative personnel from the Rio Grande Independent School District as well as project personnel

from a number of other of the special programs funded to this school district.

By mutual agreement the school provided space for the Bilingual Mini School program within the school and children attend the tutoring for a two-hour period each school day from the first grade "migrant" classroom at Grulla Elementary School. This includes children we have included in the program as pre-schoolers and are now following from site to site as school-age children. It also includes children who are migrant who will move to areas to which the program will be unable to send teaching adults to continue the program in the north (because of lack of funds for staff). These migrant children who are not followed will be considered a "contrast group" who are served only in Texas, so that their progress can be compared to that of the children who will be served with the mobile program on a continuing basis. (A separate group of children in a different town and school, who are migrant children, has also been tested as a control group who will not receive program benefits at all.)

EVALUATOR NOTE: All operating costs of the program while in Oregon and in Texas are from other sources, as the URRD funds are spent on the mobile component children only during the period of the year they are in Washington State. The total program disregarding funding source, is reported in this evaluation since the URRD proposal was funded based on the expectation of the combining of various funding sources to make possible this program, which is inter-district within Washington State, and inter-state insofar as the mobile component is concerned.

(Part B) All families of Bilingual Mini Head Start children who now attend public school will be contacted about enrolling their children in the Bilingual Mini School program.

FINDINGS:

	Total Families* with BMHS Children Now in Public School	Families Contacted About Enrolling Their Children	Percentage of Family Contacts
Connell	11	11	100%
Moses Lake	32	32	100%
Pasco	4	4	100%
Umatilla	8	8	100%
Grulla	(Information will be reported in year-end report. Recruitment now being carried out. First grade children eligible are all enrolled, but arrangements are not complete as to kindergarten children.)		

*The number of families is less than the enrolled children because some families have more than one child in the program.

CONCLUSION:

The project has met its goal of contacting families to arrange enrollment of children where the family chooses for the child now in school to continue with bilingual tutoring.

(Part C) Enrollment of at least 80% of eligible children at each site.

"Eligible" refers to children who were enrolled as preschool children in Bilingual Mini Head Start but are now enrolled in the public school. At several sites the program has also accepted children referred by the school, and at the Mabton site (inactive during this evaluation period) all participating children are by referral.

FINDINGS:

Site	Preschool Graduates Eligible	Preschool Graduates Enrolled	Percentage Eligible Enrolled	Referral Children Enrolled	Total Children Enrolled
PASCO, Wa.	5	5	100%	6	11
UMATILLA, Ore.	9	9	100%	*	9*
GRULLA, Tex.	23	23	100%	. .	23**
CONNELL, Wa.	16	14	88%	4	18
MOSES LAKE, Wa.	38	34	89%	. .	34
ALL SITES					88**

*The school asked that several children be tutored other than the target group from Grulla. The Bilingual Mini School teacher did tutor these children. However, they were not given the same curriculum as BMS children so were not counted as enrolled in the BMS program.

**These 23 children at Grulla include seven who were previously enrolled at either Pasco or Umatilla while in the north. The total for all sites gives the unduplicated enrollment.

CONCLUSION:

The project met its goal of continuing service to children graduating from the preschool program into public school for more than 80% of the "graduates" at each site.

ADDITIONAL FINDINGS:

As the newly published requirements for URRD programs define that bilingual/bicultural programs must include more than 50% children for whom English is not their dominant language, Language Dominance is also reported by site. (For definitions, see below.)

Site	English Dominant	Spanish Dominant	Bilingual Span./Eng.	Percentage for Whom English is not the Dominant Language
PASCO, Wa.	0	4	2	100%
UMATILLA, Ore.	0	3	6	100%
GRULLA, Tex.	0	7	9	100%
CONNELL, Wa.	6	3	9	78%
MOSES LAKE, Wa.	8	1	24	76%
TOTAL ALL SITES	14	18	50	83%

*Total children at all sites was 88. Of this number, five children at Pasco and one child at Moses Lake were not tested for language dominance. The above figures exclude these children.

DEFINITIONS:

Percentage for whom English is not the dominant language.--includes children listed as Spanish dominant, or Bilingual Spanish/English.

Bilingual Spanish/English.--includes children whose score in their weaker language is still over 20 points (on Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test) or more than half as high as their score in their dominant language.

Spanish dominant or English dominant.--includes children with negligible understanding of whichever is their second language as indicated by a score of less than 20 on PPVT or less than half their score in whichever is their dominant language.

Note regarding language of the home.--In all cases for children listed as either Spanish Dominant or as Bilingual Spanish/English, Spanish is indicated as a language of the home.

PROCEDURAL OBJECTIVE:

2.1 Tutoring teacher trainees will teach children using both Spanish and English following the plan for alternating language use recommended to them by the educational director, as verified by observations of bilingual teaching made by the trainers or educational director at least twice during the period of program operation.

FINDINGS:

This objective was written in March, 1974, at the time the continuation proposal was submitted. Very shortly thereafter the educational director selected the DISTAR language program, as taught bilingually (other sites using this program bilingually include East Las Vegas, New Mexico and Uvalde, Texas) as the primary vehicle for language instruction in Bilingual Mini Schools. As the materials could be obtained, and teachers trained in its use, the DISTAR program was instituted at all sites. This made obsolete the checklist observation form for bilingual teaching referred to above, which was tied to the old curriculum. As no observations were made using this checklist during the period of this evaluation, the objective cannot be evaluated.

ADDITIONAL FINDINGS:

A substitute objective fitting the program's current operations is stated and evaluated below:

Alternate 2.1 Tutoring teacher trainees will provide language instruction in both Spanish and English to all enrolled children, as indicated by an end of week progress report on the lesson level reached in each language submitted for each week of program operation to the project evaluator.

FINDINGS:

CONNELL school-age tutors report language lessons in Spanish and English every week of program operation July through December.

MOSES LAKE school-age tutors did not receive the Spanish language materials until the third week of July. After that date Spanish and English lesson progress was reported for every week of project operation.

MOBILE COMPONENT centers did not begin the DISTAR language instruction for the summer and fall programs. The Educational Director feels that during the summer months when teachers are dispersed training is sufficiently difficult that his policy is not to introduce new curriculum materials. Training in DISTAR was held during these months, but intensive training was not undertaken until the program returned to home base in Texas.

GRULLA, Texas school-age program only operated two weeks during the evaluation period. In this time Spanish and English DISTAR language lesson progress is reported for every child.

CONCLUSION:

Because of a curriculum change, the approved plan for developing Spanish and English changed during the evaluation period. The revised plan was implemented at some but not all sites as the new curriculum is being phased in. The goal is therefore considered to have been partially met.

PROCESS OBJECTIVE

2.2 Tutoring teacher trainees will give instruction in at least one lesson from the curriculum of bicultural materials each month, as documented by reports of curriculum materials taught to each child submitted to the project evaluator weekly.

FINDINGS:

Months of program operation are shown in the chart below with a "NO" or "YES" to indicate whether bicultural activities were taught that month.

Center and Teachers	7-74	8-74	9-74	10-74	11-74	12-74
CONNELL, Wa.						
A	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	. .
B	. .	. .	. .	. .	No	No
C	. .	. .	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MOSES LAKE, Wa.						
A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
B	. .	. .	. .	. .	Yes	Yes
PASCO, Wa.						
A	No	Yes	Yes	. .	. .	. .
UMATILLA, Ore.						
A	. .	. .	No	No	. .	. .
GRULLA, Tex.						
A	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	Yes
B	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	No
C	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	No
D	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .	No

The periods (. .) indicate that the teacher was not employed those months. Where there are only periods at a site it indicates the tutoring program was not operating; e.g., Pasco tutoring finished in September, Umatilla operated only September and October and Grulla only started in December 1974.

CONCLUSION:

This objective was partially met. It was most consistently carried out where the children were served for more than two hours a day (as in kindergarten enrollees where tutoring was done in the "other" half of their day). It was least consistently carried out where enrollees had 1-1/2 hours or less per day with the tutoring teacher, as in the released time schedule worked out at Umatilla, Ore., and in the after-school groups held at Connell.

PROCESS OBJECTIVE:

2.3 Tutoring teacher trainees will give instruction in the academic skills of reading and math, using University of Kansas primer followed by Sullivan Reading materials, and Singer Math materials, as documented by reports of curriculum progress submitted to the project evaluator weekly.

FINDINGS:

Project files contain weekly progress reprots from every teacher for every week of program operation, with individual end-of-week reports on placement in the above-named curriculum areas.

CONCLUSION:

This objective was met.

OUTCOME OBJECTIVE:

3.1 At least 50% of the project children will show at least a 5-point raw score gain on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary test in both their first and second language after each 100 days cumulative attendance in the program.

FINDINGS:

Testing Procedures. Attendance records are kept cumulatively for each child. When a child passes a "testing" point of 100 days in the program, or any subsequent 100-day attendance interval, the tester at the site is notified and that child is tested that month. When it is time for an evaluation report the children who passed an attendance interval during a six-month period are collectively considered the evaluation group. In this way, the test they were given measures an equal amount of project participation. This would not be the case for tests given at calendar intervals since children enter the program continuously through the year, and have quite irregular attendance while enrolled.

Form A of the PPVT is given in English to each child; Form B is given in Spanish to each child. Children are tested individually.

GAINS IN ENGLISH

PRIMARY LANGUAGE: Number tested for whom English is first language	Number and percentage who gained 5 points or more		Meets goal?
13	10	77%	Yes
SECOND LANGUAGE: Number tested for whom English is second language	**Number and percentage who gained 5 points or more**		**Meets goal?**
9	7	78%	Yes

GAINS IN SPANISH

PRIMARY LANGUAGE: Number tested for whom Spanish is first language	Number and percentage who gained 5 points or more		Meets goal?
9	4	44%	No
SECOND LANGUAGE: Number tested for whom Spanish is second language	**Number and percentage who gained 5 points or more**		**Meets goal?**
13	3	23%	No

CONCLUSION:

For this evaluation period, the project has met its goals in developing English language proficiency. It has in fact been a fairly powerful program for teaching English as a second language (average gains of 13 points, which is two-and-one-half times the gain that would be considered normal growth for a six-month increase in age).

The project came close to its goal for strengthening Spanish for children who use Spanish as their primary language; it fell far short of its goal of teaching Spanish as a second language.

EVALUATOR NOTE:

The calendar period over which these tests were taken was April through September, 1974 (dates to coincide with the Bilingual Title VII evaluation cut-off dates). This means that this period was one of transition from the old curriculum to the new language curriculum.

Children in the year-round northern centers phased in the new materials as they received training and materials, being operational in both languages by July. This means that children tested between April-September would have from very few days to no days at all in the new curriculum, depending on the date of their tests. All children in the mobile component had no experience in the new curriculum when tested, since the Educational Director waited for the project to return to home base before changing curriculum.

The reason for changing curriculum was that the old curriculum was not producing the growth in language that the project has as its goal. This evaluation, however, reflects attendance primarily under the old curriculum. The next evalution will be the first in which a substantial influence will be felt from the curriculum changes which have been made.

OUTCOME OBJECTIVE:

3.2 At least 75% of project children will receive a performance rating of satisfactory for one or more cultural heritage lessons (i.e., songs, finger plays, educational games, stories about family traditions or traditional holidays, dances, etc.) for each four weeks enrollment in the program as evidenced by cultural heritage mastery tests submitted to the project evaluator.

FINDINGS:

This objective cannot be evaluated at this date because the tests which the teachers were to use to measure child performance on cultural heritage lessons taught were not ready to be used. They have been under development throughout this period, and workshops are scheduled in Washington State on January 24 and in Texas on January 31 to introduce teachers to the tests and procedures for using them.

Since no tests have been submitted on cultural heritage material taught during the past six months, no percentage evaluation is possible.

CONCLUSION:

This objective was not evaluated, because the tests to be used took longer to develop than anticipated and will not be ready for introduction and use until late January, 1975.

OUTCOME OBJECTIVE:

3.3 At least 50% of the project children will have advanced by at least one month in grade equivalent level score for each 20 days cumulative attendance since their previous test on the math and on the reading sections of the Wide Range Achievement Test, administered individually in the child's primary language.

FINDINGS:

GAIN IN MATH

Number of children in test group for whom pre- and post-tests were available	Number and percentage of children who gained one or more months in grade-equivalent score for each 20 days attended	Meets goal?
28	23	82%

GAIN IN READING

Number of children in test group for whom pre- and post-tests were available	Number and percentage of children who gained one or more months in grade-equivalent score for each 20 days attended	Meets goal?
18	13	72%

CONCLUSION:

This objective was met and exceeded. Children are showing an accelerated gain in both math and reading.

SUMMARY OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES

	Exceeded	Met	Partially Met	Not Met
INSTITUTIONAL OBJECTIVES				
1(A) Project will coordinate with school administrators at each site.		X		
1(B) Project will contact all families of children eligible to attend.		X		
1(C) Project will enroll at least 80% of eligible children at each site.		X		
PROECEDURAL OBJECTIVES				
2.1 Project teachers will use approved plan for alternating Spanish and English.			X	
2.2 Project teachers will give lessons from bicultural curriculum each month.			X	
2.3 Project teachers will give lessons in math and reading reporting weekly progress.		X		
EDUCATIONAL OUTCOME OBJECTIVES				
3.1 Children will show at least a 5-point raw score gain on PPVT after each 100 days attendance:				
(A) In English as first language		X		
(B) In Spanish as first language			X	
(C) In English as second language	X			
(D) In Spanish as second language				X
3.2 At least 75% of project children will receive a rating of satisfactory on cultural heritage tests.	Not available because of delay in developing tests			
3.3 At least 50% of project children will show an advancement of one or more months in grade equivalent score on WRAT for each 20 days attended.				
(A) In MATH	X			
(B) In READING	X			

NARRATIVE PROGRESS REPORT

Although this is the third evaluation report on this program, it has been in operation less than a year (start-up in Washington State Centers in February, 1974, and for the mobile component in May, 1974). In this year a number of start-up year adjustments have been needed.

CURRICULUM

In the July, 1974, evaluation it was reported that placement of the children was a problem--how to determine the appropriate level where the child should be working in the curriculum materials quickly so that the teacher did not waste his time reviewing what he already knew. Since that time tests have been developed for the math, reading, and language curriculum areas which enable us to quickly place the child when he enters the program. An additional benefit of these achievement tests is that it shows up "holes" in the child's concept mastery up to the point where he is working. When children move or are absent a lot there is a loss of academic skills. Children working at level two arithmetic may have forgotten key concepts covered in the kindergarten or level one work. This makes the higher levels increasingly more difficult for them, unless remediation can take place. With these achievement tests each initial placement also shows up weak concept areas in previous materials covered, so the tutoring teacher can do very selective remediation.

Thus far, we have only trained outside testers in use of these materials. This sometimes involves a time delay, so it is under consideration to have all tutoring teachers trained in the

use of these instruments so they can handle placement and identification of remediation areas without waiting the time schedule of the outside tester.

Also in the July evaluation it was reported that much time had been spent seeking programmed and demonstrably effective language development materials to replace what we were using. (The discarded materials were not programmed, could not be tracked, and took too much teacher preparation time.) At this writing a new curriculum was selected: DISTAR Language in English and in Spanish (using the Spanish materials developed at East Las Vegas, New Mexico). This material has been phased into use as the materials could be obtained and distributed (reproduced in cases of the Spanish version as these are not commercially available), and as training of staff could take place. Achievement tests for both Spanish and English have been developed and put into use. A number of things remain to be done, however.

The New Mexico Spanish is different in many cases from the Texas Spanish commonly used by migrants. We have, therefore, with permission of the author, begun retranslating the materials. In so doing we have found a number of other things about the Spanish version which will need correction. In English the materials are aimed at getting children producing language in whole sentences as well as learning vocabulary and logical concepts. In Spanish the material is written with the teacher saying much more, the children saying much less. As an example: In English the material would ask: "What is this?" and the child answer "A chair," then the teacher would instruct, "Say the whole thing," and the child would say "This is a chair." In Spanish the teacher would ask,

"Is this a chair?" with the child answering "Yes" and the teacher then saying, "Yes, this is a chair. Repeat after me: This is a chair" ard the child echoing her statement, "This is a chair." There are a number of other cases like this where the Spanish has been watered down in difficulty. It is clear that the redesigning of these materials and their subsequent production and distribution will absorb a great deal of time. We will be phasing in the revised materials throughout the rest of this program year.

We are also working on, but have not finished specific training raterials following our project format for teaching of the language materials. This should also be a product of the project achieved during the remainder of this program year. In lieu of such materials we have used outside consultants, and informal training by training staff.

The project began this year with a substantial curriculum of bicultural activities which feature the Mexican culture. We did not, however, have methods developed to judge children's learning in these areas. During the first half of this program year we have added materials from United States and other nation's cultures to this material, and have developed a set of tests. These will be initiated by late January, after which they will probably need some revision as we field test them. The tests are related to our particular curriculum materials. There is very little developed by way of tests of bicultural understanding that would be appropriate for use below second grade. We will be able to meet the new URRD requirement that this area of knowledge is measurably described and tested by the end of this program year.

As there is so little available it may be that we will have instruments that other projects attempting to meet this requirement will be interested in adopting.

COORDINATION AND SCHEDULING

An enormous expenditure of administrative time has gone into introducing the concept of the project to school administrators and gaining their acceptance and cooperation. There has been great success in this, and very much acceptance of the program, especially in cases where the tutoring is held at the school, in released time or as an after-school program. The school people have been more aware of it in these cases than at the two sites where children leave the school to go to another location.

The after-school scheduling remains somewhat of a problem. If children have to be transported to another site the tutoring time has bussing time added on at both ends and we are getting children home after 6 p.m. in Moses Lake. The fatigue factor is inevitable with this kind of scheduling, and some adjustment needs to be worked out if any is possible. The largest number of children who have dropped out of the program after enrollment has been at this site because of this late schedule.

The project has used some full-time tutors who work with children throughout the day, saving what time they need for training and preparation time. However, as reported in the July, 1974, evaluation, there is a concentration of children whose available time is in the afternoon or after school. If children are on released time, the classroom teacher usually does math and reading in the morning and is most willing to release the child during

less structured activities or play periods in the afternoon. Since training needed to work in this program is quite extensive, it is not attractive to try to obtain part-time people and give them that much training for that little service. The project has, therefore, experimented with "piggy-back" teaching. Teachers employed to work with younger children during the early part of the day are reassigned an afternoon or after-school school-age group. As these teachers are trained in the curriculum this has proved an efficient way of accommodating the afternoon "bulge" of children.

Our success in tracking and continuing to serve the school-age children in the mobile component can't be determined until a year from now. We use as our base group the La Grulla children, served during the winter, and calculate a percentage of those we manage to follow and serve again in the north. This past summer the program did have some operating school-age programs, but it is difficult to initiate a new program during the northern phase. A full cycle will not have been evaluated until the December, 1975, evaluation of home base-to north-to home base cycle is completed.

CONCLUSION

Real progress has occurred in developing the curriculum, training and monitoring instruments that are needed to make this program work with all paraprofessionals as staff.

Coordination has been worked out with every school district we overlap so that the program has been able to give the child the benefit of both programs in a mutually reinforcing way.

Children are making accelerated progress in developing their language skills in English as a second language. New language curriculum materials are being introduced, field tested, and revised to meet the need for a more powerful program in the development of skills in Spanish, both as a child's primary or as his second language.

Children are making accelerated progress in math and in reading far beyond the project's initial goals.

The project is still in the development stage, as outlined in the narrative progress report. Even at this point, it is reaching substantial numbers of children with significant effect on their educational progress.